The University of Chicago

THE LITERATURE OF ADVANCED SCHOOL READERS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1785–1900

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1934

By

VINCENT ALEXANDER DAVIS

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1937

The University of Chicago

THE LITERATURE OF ADVANCED SCHOOL READERS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1785-1900

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1934

By

VINCENT ALEXANDER DAVIS

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1937

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to present the results of a historical survey of the literature of advanced school-readers in the United States, from 1785 to 1900, and to attempt an evaluation of the literature found, by delimiting the term "literature," and by setting up certain criteria for determining different degrees of literary excellence.

The boundary dates have been selected because they have special significance in connection with the development of school-readers. The first date is that of the publication of the first reading-book of American authorship--Noah Webster's Third Part of a Grammatical Institute.[1] The second date has been selected for several reasons: first, because by 1900 the supplementary reading series were in general use throughout the country; second, the line of division between high school and the upper grades of the elementary school had by that time become clearly defined; and third, the opening years of the twentieth century mark the beginning of the most significant period in American education--a period characterized by the rise of pragmatism, by rapidly changing social and economic conditions, and by the application of scientific method to the study of school problems, especially of reading.[2]

---

[1] "Letter from Webster to Henry Barnard," American Journal of Education, XIII (1863), 123.

[2] In 1897 appeared Quantz's Psychology of Reading (Macmillan), which was the forerunner of numerous discussions and experiments in the field of reading.

Perhaps it is safe to assert that the time has come when no one who is familiar with the forces at work in education will deny the educational value and cultural significance of literature in our schools. Even as early as the closing decades of the eighteenth century there was legislative recognition of literature as an important factor in the training of a free people.[1] This recognition was no mere pronouncement--no mere matter of form. As will be shown later in this study, the compilers of the readers, in the main, kept in view, from the first, the principle enunciated in the Massachusetts Constitution, adhering to it rather consistently throughout the period when other subject matter than literature was making strong claims to preference.

A survey of what the leading educators have had to say of literature shows that, practically without exception, they have ascribed to it a unique educative and cultural value.[2]

---

[1] The Constitution of Massachusetts, which was adopted in 1780, declared that literature should be encouraged and fostered because its influence is "to countenance and inculcate the principles of humanity and general benevolence, public and private charity, industry and frugality, honesty and punctuality in dealings, sincerity and good humor, and all social affections and generous sentiments among the people."

[2] Paul Hanus, Educational Aims and Educational Values, p. 14. New York: Macmillan Co., 1900.

William C. Bagley, Educational Values, p. 169. New York: Macmillan Co., 1922.

Alexander Inglis, Principles of Secondary Education, p. 439. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1918.

Cited in Sadler's Moral Instruction and Training in Schools, I, 223, 299. New York, London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908.

John Dewey, Democracy and Education, p. 279. New York: Macmillan Co., 1916.

Bureau of Education Bulletin, No. 2, Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools (1917), 32.

Samuel Chester Parker, Methods of Teaching in High School, p. 256. Boston, New York: Ginn & Co., 1915.

Charles De Garmo, Principles of Secondary Education, I (The Studies), 228, 229. New York: Macmillan Co., 1913.

William A. and Harriet H. Millis, The Teaching of High School Subjects, p. 112. New York, London: The Century Co., 1925.

J. C. Chapman and G. S. Counts, Principles of Education, p. 322. New York, Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1924.

Influence of Literature

At this late day it is practically impossible to procure an accurate measure of the influence exerted by the literature of the school-readers: but it is known that the reading-book was virtually the only textbook used in most of our early schools, and that the study of reading remained the matter of chief consideration until well toward the close of the eighteenth century. It is also known that during the period from 1820 to 1840 the schools, especially those of rural and small urban centers, were kept open but a few months of the year, that books were expensive, and that newspapers and magazines were scarce. Under such conditions the school-reader was often the only source of secular reading material to be found in many American homes.

It can not be known with certainty how careful the teachers of those early decades were to make clear to their charges the moral and ethical lessons in the reading-books; but there is evidence that at least some of those teachers were at pains to make such lessons specific. It is not known to what extent the early reading-books were read in the homes during the long evenings when school was not in session. It is known, however, that in some homes it was the custom to read aloud and to recite from the school-readers.

A writer for Scribner's Magazine has given us a picture of what took place in one home during this early period. According to her account, each member of the household chose and read aloud his favorites--always poems, in this particular household. Jack's favorites were "Marco Bozzaris," "The Eve of Waterloo," and "The Charge of the Light Brigade"; Ted preferred "The Burial of Moses" and "The Execution of Montrose"; Nell always chose "Lochinvar" and "Lord Ullin's Daughter"; while the writer of the article preferred

"The Arab's Farewell to His Steed." She concludes with the statement that other of the favorites read around the evening fire were Finch's "The Blue and the Gray," Browning's "How They Brought the Good News from Ghent to Aix," Bryant's "The First Snowfall," and Scott's "Love of Country." This synopsis of the article has been given in detail to show that even the children in those days had their preferences and that they were accustomed to use their school-readers in the home.[1]

Compilers' Estimate of the Cultural Value of Literature

That the compilers of our readers thought the school-readers capable of exerting very definite influences is obvious from their prefatory statements of purpose. In the prefaces we find the following purposes outlined: to present a connected plan of morality, "in a simple, informal way, free from that unpleasing formality with which she is too often disguised by partial or mistaken pedants;"[2] to omit everything that might corrupt the young mind or offend the innocent;[3] to supply high moral precepts to the vitiated rising generation, and to lead children to more closely follow Jesus;[4] to select such pieces as are proper for youth, not only in correctness of diction and purity of style, but by the moral tendency of the matter itself;[5] to inspire the rising generation with an ardent attachment for the institutions of our country;[6]

---

1 "The Point of View," Scribner's Magazine, LII (1912), 762-64.

2 A. Fisher, A Pleasing Instructor. Boston: Joseph Bumstead, 1795.

3 Nathaniel Heaton, Columbian Preceptor. Wrentham, Mass.: Nathaniel Heaton, 1801.

4 George Chipman, The American Moralist. Wrentham, Mass.: Nathaniel Heaton, 1801.

5 Anonymous, New York Reader No. 3. New York: Samuel Wood & Sons, 1819.

6 Joseph Richardson, The American Reader. Boston: Lincoln & Edmands, 1813.

to counteract both the open and secret labors of infidelity;[1] to supply lessons on chastity, virtue, morality, patriotism, and piety;[2] to include nothing pernicious to the young mind, and to exclude all selections in which serious things are treated with unbecoming levity;[3] to combat the liquor interests;[4] to promote a knowledge of republican principles among our youth;[5] to eradicate vulgar prejudices and rusticity of manners, improve the understanding, rectify the will, pacify the passions, and direct the minds of youth to the pursuits of proper objects;[6] to give the students who do not aspire to belles lettres a love of pure, beautiful, invigorating elements in literature, which while elevating the soul, promote healthful mental growth;[7] to inspire the pupil and encourage him to read other books;[8] to teach us what to love and what to hate, whom to honor and whom to despise;[9] to cultivate a taste for the best style in literature, as to both thought and composition.[10]

Other objectives, which emphasize the actual influences of literature, are more elaborately set forth.

---

[1] Lindley Murray, Sequel to the English Reader. Woodstock, Vt.: D. Watson, 1821.

[2] M. R. Bartlett, Practical Reader. New York: Myers & Smith, 1822.

[3] James Hall, Western Reader. Cincinnati: Corey, Fairbank & Webster, 1835.

[4] Charles Yale, The Temperance Reader. Boston: Hillard, Gray & Co., 1835.

[5] Henry Houseworth, The Federurbian. Philomath, Ind.: W. E. Johnston, printer, 1839.

[6] J. Hamilton Moore, Young Gentleman and Lady's Monitor. New York: Hodge, Allen & Campbell, 1790.

[7] J. Madison Watson, Independent Sixth Reader. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co., 1877.

[8] George I. Aldrich and Alexander Forbes, The Progressive Course in Reading, Part IV. New York, Philadelphia, Chicago: Butler, Sheldon & Co., 1900.

[9] William DeWitt Hyde, The School Speaker and Reader. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1900.

[10] James Baldwin, School Reading by Grades. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Co., 1900.

The value of proper selections for the use of the schools is well known to all who have been conversant with the instruction of youth.[1]

The influence of school exercises in the formation of character is well known, and nowhere is this so true as in the field of reading.[2]

We well know how great is the influence of school exercises in the formation of young minds; and perhaps in no department of education does that influence operate with more force than through the medium of exercises for recitation.[3]

Sentiments found in the reading-books are perused till they are not only lodged in the memory, but imprinted on the heart, and almost incorporated with the lineaments of the soul itself. Many individuals, now in middle age, will carry to the end of life the impressions which they received from the pages of the American Preceptor and The Art of Reading.[4]

A course of instruction in reading is, in an important sense, a course of instruction in taste and morals.[5]

No one who recalls his own youth need be told how lasting are the impressions made by the pieces habitually read in the school-room, and how they shape and color the mind through life.[6]

A good piece, even though it may have been worn threadbare by the young reader long before he quite understood its meaning, may rise up to his memory in after life with restored and appreciated charms.[7]

School-readers have greater influence on character development than any other books.[8]

In sections of the country where supplementary reading is not provided, and where easy access to libraries can not be had, the pupil will con his reader as his one fountain of supply, retaining through life distinct remembrances of it as his introduction to the world of letters. In cities, the reading-book is rather the gauge by which to measure the quality of the flood of literature

---

[1] Joseph Dana, A New American Selection of Lessons in Reading and Speaking. Boston: Samuel Hall, 1792.

[2] Lyman Cobb, North American Reader. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1835.

[3] B. D. Emerson, The Academical Speaker. Boston: Carter, Hendee & Co., 1833.

[4] B. B. Edwards, The Eclectic Reader. Boston: Perkins, Marvin & Co.; Philadelphia: Henry Perkins, 1835.

[5] Charles W. Sanders, Sanders' Fifth Reader. New York, Chicago: Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor & Co., 1859.

[6] G. S. Hillard, The Sixth Reader. Boston: Brewer & Tileston; Portland, Maine: Bailey & Noyes, 1865.

[7] Epes Sargent and Amos May, New American Fifth Reader, Philadelphia: Butler & Co., 1871.

[8] Lewis B. Monroe, The Sixth Reader. Philadelphia: Cowperthwaite & Co., 1872.

which waits to be appropriated. In each of these offices the work of the School Reader is a great one. Its importance can hardly be estimated.[1]

This volume introduces you to some of the best literature in the language. It comes at a time when your taste for reading is rapidly maturing. Your reading will largely control your thinking, and your thinking will control your life.[2]

That some of the objectives set forth by the compilers were apparently realized may be gathered from certain testimonies which have come down to us.

Professor Swing once declared that the books which had most influenced his life were the Bible, Calvin's Institutes, Fox's Book of Martyrs, and McGuffey's Sixth Reader. Of the reader he said, "Up out of the far off years come all the blessed lessons in virtue and righteousness which those reading books taught."[3] Herbert Quick spoke of the reading-books that he had studied (McGuffey's) as "the most influential volumes ever published in America." He describes their influence in these words.

When I did come to read the English classics, I felt as one who meets in after years a charming person with whom he has had a chance encounter on the train.....I could say when I opened my Shakspere, my Milton, or my Byron: 'Why, don't you remember our meeting away back on the farm, in that old book with the cover torn off?'[4]

Ex-governor Lowden, in 1927, could recall as his favorites: Bryant's "Thanatopsis," Byron's "Battle of Waterloo," the famous extract from Webster's "Reply to Hayne," and Wirt's "The Blind Preacher."[5] Will Owen Jones, of the Nebraska State Journal, reports that he asked a group of people what book or books had influenced them most, and that a majority of them instantly named

---

1 William Stickney, A Fifth Reader, Eds. R. I. Fulton and T. C. Trueblood. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1892.

2 Sherman Williams, Choice Literature, Book II. New York: American Book Co., 1898.

3 Henry H. Vail, A History of the McGuffey Reader, pp. 12, 13. Cleveland: Burrows Brothers Co., 1911.

4 One Man's Life, p. 163. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1925.

5 Mark Sullivan, Our Times, II, 13. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927.

McGuffey's Fifth Reader.[1] John H. Clarke, former Justice of the U. S. Supreme Court, said, fifty years after his elementary school days: "The selections in these readers (McGuffey's) were for the most part serious and of real worth. Oftentimes, expressions, even yet, come into my mind, which very certainly were derived from them."[2] The late Senator Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana, declared recently that McGuffey's Sixth Reader was the foundation of what he knew of literature.[3] Ex-governor James M. Cox, of Ohio, declared that McGuffey's readers gave him an affection for literature, and a grounding in it that have remained with him through the years. The selections that he regards as outstanding were "Dawn," by Everett; "Description of a Storm," by Disraeli; "The Death of Little Nell," by Dickens; "Elegy in a Country Churchyard," by Gray; "Speech before the House of Burgesses," by Henry; "The Snow Shower," by Bryant; "Soldier Sleep," by Scott; the church scene from Longfellow's "Evangeline"; and Antony's funeral oration.[4] Joseph Fort Newton wrote: "For many a boy of the older West, McGuffey's varied and wise selections from the best English authors were the very gates of literature ajar."[5]

Sullivan finds, in the tie that was formed between the American schoolboy and such English writers as Shakespeare, Milton, and Byron, an explanation of the fact that during the World War America made common cause with England against Germany and her allies. He asserts that many Americans were unconsciously moved by a feeling that they were one with Shakespeare and Milton, and concludes with the Query: "Had American school children been brought up on Göethe and Heine, as they were on Shakespeare and

---

1 Sullivan, op. cit., p. 13.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., p. 14.
4 Ibid., p. 46.
5 Ibid., p. 47.

Milton, is it certain America's role in the Great War would have been the same?"[1]

The writer is unwilling to go as far as Sullivan goes in estimating the influence of the material found in our school-readers; yet he believes that the attitudes and ideals of the American people owe no little to the material they read in the public schools. While it is true that the majority of those whose testimony has just been reviewed are persons who naturally would have got the most out of every opportunity, it is also true that the thousands of men and women still living who were brought up on McGuffey, who have expressed themselves in no other way than to attach themselves to a "McGuffey Club," are no less appreciative of what McGuffey gave them than are those who, with eloquent tongues and facile pens have sung the praises of the Eclectic Series.

The McGuffey Readers Not the Only Influential Ones

From what has been said, the reader might conclude that the McGuffey readers were the only ones that achieved popularity. Such a conclusion, however, would be far from the truth. At different times during the period covered by this study, there were epochal reading-books--books whose popularity was a matter of concern to the editors of competitive series. The first of these popular reading-books was Caleb Bingham's American Preceptor (1794), which went through many editions and held its own against all competitors for at least a quarter of a century.[2] One of the most popular reading-books ever used in America was The English Reader of Lindley Murray. This reader, unlike its popular

---

1 Sullivan, op. cit., p. 48.
2 William Fowle, American Journal of Education, V (1858), p. 341.

predecessor, The Preceptor, was made up largely of literary selections, and achieved such popularity that both Pierpont[1] and Cobb[2] felt justified in appealing against it to the patriotism of the American public, in the prefaces to their own readers.

Another outstanding reader was Pierpont's American First Class Book, first published in 1823, the first of a series of readers which enjoyed an unrivaled popularity. It had a long life and a wide circulation.[3] The Pierpont readers were unique in that they recognized literature as the core of content, and contained considerable material by American authors.[4]

The Lyman Cobb readers marked a decided revolt against the school-reader whose content was made up largely of selections from English writers. The preface to his American Reader contained the following declaration of independence.

> The pieces of this work are chiefly American. The English Reader, the book most generally used in the schools of our country, does not contain a single piece or paragraph written by an American citizen. Is this good policy? Is it patriotism? Shall the children of this great nation be compelled to read, year after year, none but the writings and speeches of men whose views and feelings are in direct opposition to our institutions and our government?[5]

The Cobb readers were extensively used in the Middle-Eastern states, especially in Philadelphia, Baltimore, New York City, and Brooklyn. If the preface to the edition of 1844 can be relied upon, more than six million copies were sold between 1831 and 1844. The Cobb series differed from the Pierpont readers in presenting much more material which seems to have been designed

---

1 John Pierpont, The National Reader. Boston: Hilliard, Gray, Little & Wilkins, 1828.

2 Lyman Cobb, The North American Reader. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1835.

3 Rudolph Reeder, The Historical Development of School Readers and of Methods in Teaching Reading, Columbia University Contribution to Philosophy, Psychology, and Education, No. 2, VIII, 37. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1900.

4 Reeder, op. cit., pp. 47, 49.

5 Cobb, op. cit.

to serve the needs and appeal to the interests of children. Reeder declares that the Cobb readers were almost as popular as Pierpont's.[1]

Reeder cites as the most popular readers of the period 1840-50, those of Goodrich (Peter Parley), Swan, and Tower; for the period 1850-60, McGuffey, Sanders, Hillard, Watson, and Town and Holbrook.[2]

Circulation of the Popular Reading-Books

While it is impossible to present figures as to the circulation of many of these early readers, it is logical to conclude that there must have been considerable demand for any reader whose life span was twenty, thirty, or forty years. Each of those readers which Reeder has cited had a comparatively long life, each having run into several editions; and it is very probable that, in the absence of specific proof as to the extent of their circulation, their life periods warrant the inference that they were popular. This brief sketch of a few of the popular readers may serve to show that the McGuffey, popular as it was, was by no means the only reading-book that may have exerted a profound influence on the children of America.

There might be those, however, who will insist that the legislators, book compilers, and educators, who have expressed faith in, and borne testimony to, the cultural value of literature, have assumed that literature, before it can perform the functions they have been willing to ascribe to it, must be taught systematically and with those functions in mind. That the literary material of the school-readers was likely to exert at least a modicum of influence, regardless of the degree of thoroughness with

---

1 Reeder, op. cit., p. 47.
2 Ibid., p. 46.

which it was presented, is entirely in accord with common experience. One writer asserts that the school reader was the only textbook used in the early school that bore directly and positively upon the formation of character, or provided ethical guidance.[1] Another is of the opinion that the school readers must have had the greatest general cultural influence of all the elementary literature of learning, and that the social and religious conservatism which lay at the root of Middle-Western civilization in a later period was instilled into the minds of the pioneer generations, by Adams' Gentleman and Lady's Explanatory Monitor, and similar books that were used as school-readers.[2] Since the evidence as to the early methods of presenting reading material is somewhat contradictory, it is but fair to present some of it in detail.

Early Methods of Presenting Literature

The Honorable Joseph T. Buckingham, who attended school at Windham, Connecticut, between the years 1790 and 1800, refers to one of his teachers, a Mr. Ripley, who "took great pains to teach his charges to read."[3] Buckingham does not, however, indicate what he means by the term "teaching to read."

Everett, whose first schooling must have been around 1800, once said that by the end of his ninth year he could parse almost any sentence in the American Preceptor.[4] Such a statement implies that the school-reader, in Everett's school at least, was used as a grammar text, whatever other purpose it may have served.[5]

Dr. William Darlington, who attended school at Birmingham,

---

[1] Sullivan, op. cit., pp. 8, 9.

[2] Ralph Leslie Rusk, The Literature of the Middle Western Frontier, I, 264-65. New York: Columbia University Press, 1925.

[3] "Schools As They Were Sixty Years Ago," Am. Journal of Ed., XIII (1863), 132.

[4] Very likely Bingham's Preceptor, which was published in 1794.

[5] Am. Journal of Ed., XIII, 747.

Pennsylvania, near the close of the eighteenth century, describes a Mr. Forsythe, who had been one of his early teachers, as a master "who ever took delight in introducing youthful genius to the bright fields of literature and science."[1]

John Davis, an English gentleman, who taught for a brief period in an "old field school" in Virginia, refers in his book, Travels of Four and a Half Years in the United States, to the great liking some of his students had for Goldsmith, Defoe, and Addison in preference to "the unconnected lessons of Scott,[2] the tasteless selections of Bingham, and the florid harangues of Noah Webster."[3] For an American, such derogatory remarks concerning Bingham and Webster would have been little short of treason.

Daniel Webster, who was born in 1782, once said that when he was ten years old he could repeat most of Dr. Watt's Psalms and Hymns by heart, and was well acquainted with Addison and Pope.[4]

The reading exercises in the school which Bronson Alcott attended during his early childhood, seem, from the description found in Volume XVI of Barnard's American Journal of Education, to have been extremely formal.[5]

That there were, as early as 1790, ingenious masters who were far in advance of their day, is evident from such accounts as the one published in the Universal Asylum and Columbian Magazine.[6] In this article, which is a reproduction of a letter written from

---

1 Am. Journal of Ed., XIII, 742.

2 Scott's Lessons in Elocution, analyzed in this study. Scott was an Englishman.

3 Am. Journal of Ed., XIII, 749.

4 "Schools and Teachers," Am. Journal of Ed., XXVII (1877), 282, 283.

5 "The instructor generally, though not always, read the first verse or paragraph, and sometimes read with them (the pupils) in his turn. The instructor, or the pupil at the head, made the corrections. These extended no farther than the right pronunciation of the words and a measured attention to the pauses."

6 Issue of September 1790, Philadelphia.

Boston, under date of July, 1790, the author describes a composition lesson in a Connecticut academy (probably that of Timothy Dwight), in which lesson the pupils read to the class, letters they had received from their classmates[1]--a method of composition teaching of which even this method-wise twentieth century would heartily approve.

In the Western Literary Institute, 1838, the writer found what seems to be one of the earliest formal claims for literature as a social force. Such a claim clearly implies an intelligent understanding of what is read.[2]

The Black River Literary and Religious Institute, in 1839 reported that children enrolled in that institution were required to give the substance of what they read.[3]

In the regents' report to the University of the State of New York appears the statement that in Logic, Rhetoric, and Mental and Moral Philosophy, "ideas, rather than the words of an author," were required.[4]

In the Boston Schools it was recommended that literature be so taught as to form a taste for good literature; to encourage careful and systematic reading, and to illustrate principles which should guide after-school reading.[5] These objectives will not suffer when compared with those outlined in the report of the committee on the Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools, almost a half-century later.[6]

The evidence so far examined seems to indicate that from

---

[1] Anon., "Improved Mode of Education," Am. Journal of Ed., XVII (1867), 185.

[2] P. 110.

[3] Fifty-third Regents Report, p. 96. Albany: Thurlow Weed, printer, 1840.

[4] Ibid., p. 88.

[5] Committee Document, Boston School Reports, No. 29 (1877), 4.

[6] Bureau of Education Bulletin, No. 2, op. cit.

the very first an understanding of what was read was assumed to be necessary; and that, by some means the lessons of our school-readers have impressed themselves on the youth of the passing generations. However, there is highly respectable evidence on the other side of the matter.

Horace Mann's Testimony

In one of his reports to the Board of Education, Horace Mann wrote at considerable length on the matter of comprehension. He sets his problem in these words: "Do they (the pupils) fail to master the sense of the reading lessons? Is there a presence in the minds of the scholars, when reading, of the ideas and feelings intended to be conveyed and excited by the author?"[1]

Mann's conclusion, which is based on reports from school committees and from observations he made while visiting the schools, was that there was a lamentable "want of intelligence respecting the subject matter of the lessons."[2]

Summary of Evidence

If, as we must conclude from Mann's description of the reading situation in the best schools of Massachusetts, the pupils understood the meaning of little that they read, it is safe to assume that if the Massachusetts pupil of that particular period got much out of the literature of his school-reader, he had to get it through 'exposure.' If, however, he did get what he got in that way, the influence exerted by the literature need not have been negligible, much as it may be regretted that he received little assistance from his teachers. In fact, Crow found in his study that on the whole "reading" assured a higher score of appreciation,

---

[1] Cited from Lectures and Annual Reports on Education, ed. Mrs. Mary Mann, p. 508. Cambridge: Published for the Editor, 1867.

[2] Op. cit., pp. 506-7; 531-32.

for both boys and girls on a fair percentage of the classics which he used in his study, than did "close class study."[1] Moreover, it has long been assumed in this country, that people are influenced by mere contact with what they read. The rigorous laws against the publication of obscene and profane language are based on this assumption. It would seem, then, a reasonable conclusion, in the absence of satisfactory specific proof one way or the other, that the children of America have always been influenced, in some measure, by what they have found in their school-readers.

Reading Tastes of the Earlier Periods

In the light of such criticisms as those of Mann, and from the knowledge available from other sources concerning the primitive character of our schools during the first four or five decades of our national life, it is perhaps but natural to be skeptical of the literary tastes and reading habits of the masses. How erroneous such a conclusion would be, however, is evident when the real situation is revealed.

In 1813 Byron was delighted to learn that his verses were being read on the banks of the Ohio.[2] That there must have been considerable demand for his work is indicated by the fact that his Manfred was printed and published in the United States on the same day it arrived from England.[3] Bristed stated in 1818 that the best English poets were as much read here as in Britain; that Milton, Cowper, Burns, Scott, Southey, Byron, Campbell, and Moore were at that time "formidable rivals to our American bards."[4]

---

[1] Charles Sumner Crow, Evaluation of English Literature in the High School, Contribution to Education, No. 141, p. 171. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1924.

[2] Letters and Journals, Journal, Dec. 5, 1813, ed. Rowland E. Prothero, II, 360. New York: Scribner & Sons, 1898.

[3] H. B. Fearon, Sketches of America[2], p. 35. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme & Brown, 1818.

[4] John Bristed, The Resources of the United States of America, p. 356. New York James Eastburn & Co., 1818.

Rusk declares that there was scarcely an important writer in the whole range of English literature, from Chaucer to Tennyson, who did not achieve some slight vogue, even in the pioneer west.[1] DeTocqueville was surprised at the great number of volumes of Shakespeare's works he found in the cabins of the frontier, although his report was probably exaggerated.[2] Shakespeare's popularity, however, is shown by the fact that of the more than seven thousand plays presented in frontier territory during the period from 1810 to 1840, one out of every eighteen was a Shakespeare play.[3] One who thinks that the people of the United States have at any period been uninfluenced by literature should read Rusk's chapter on "The Vogue of British and Eastern Writers," in the second volume of his valuable work.[4]

The Public As Critics of Literary Material

Nor were the masses in the frontier without capable guidance in the field of criticism. Rusk suggests that Eastern critics must often have directed the literary tastes of the West. That the West was nevertheless independent enough to assert its preferences is seen in the fact that that section of the country showed a decided fondness for English writers in preference to even the most popular poets and novelists of New England.[5]

It would seem, then, that while there is no means of accurately estimating the degree of influence exerted on our people by literature, there is ample evidence that that influence was too significant to be disregarded by one who would seek out the forces that have influenced our national growth and development.

---

1 Rusk, op. cit., II, 4.
2 Ibid., p. 6.
3 Ibid., p. 5.
4 Ibid., Chap. IX.
5 Ibid., pp. 30, 31.

CHAPTER II

METHOD OF THE STUDY

This chapter seeks to outline the method of gathering the data, to set up and justify the criteria employed in identifying and evaluating the literature found in the school-readers, and to indicate some of the problems for which a solution is sought.

The sources used were the readers themselves. By far the greater number of these readers were analyzed by the writer, during a summer spent in the Antiquarian Library, of Worcester, Massachusetts; Widener Library, at Harvard; Essex Institute, Essex, Massachusetts, and the Boston Public Library. The major part of the time was spent at Worcester and Cambridge, with side trips to the other two places.

After he had completed his work in these four libraries, which together have what is reputed to be the most nearly complete text-book collection in the country, the writer, in an effort to locate additional material, enlisted the coöperation of all the State Universities and the following private and semi-private libraries.

Carnegie Library	Pittsburg	Pennsylvania
Chapin Library, Williams College	Williamstown	Massachusetts
Connecticut Historical Society	Hartford	Connecticut
Dartmouth College	Hanover	New Hampshire
Free Public Library	Philadelphia	Pennsylvania
John Hay Library, Brown University	Providence	Rhode Island
Maine Historical Society	Portland	Maine
Massachusetts Historical Society	Boston	Massachusetts
University of Michigan	Ann Arbor	Michigan
New Hampshire State Library	Concord	New Hampshire
New York State Library	Albany	New York
University of Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	Pennsylvania
Pequot Library	Southport	Connecticut
Princeton University	Princeton	New Jersey

Providence Athenaeum	Providence	Rhode Island
Providence Public Library	Providence	Rhode Island
Rutgers College	New Brunswick	New Jersey
Springfield Public Library	Springfield	Ohio
Teachers College, Columbia	New York City	New York
Trinity College	Hartford	Connecticut
Union University	Schenectady	New York
Vermont Historical Society	Montpelier	Vermont
Watkinson Library[1]	Hartford	Connecticut
Woburn Public Library	Woburn	Massachusetts
Yale University Library	New Haven	Connecticut
Allegheny College	Meadville	Pennsylvania
Amherst College	Amherst	Massachusetts
Bowdoin College	Brunswick	Maine
George Peabody College for Teachers	Nashville	Tennessee
Howard Memorial Library	New Orleans	Louisiana
University of North Carolina	Chapel Hill	North Carolina
University of Texas	Austin	Texas
Vanderbilt University	Nashville	Tennessee

To each of these libraries the writer sent a letter explaining the purpose and nature of the study, and summarizing the work that had already been done. Accompanying each letter was a mimeographed list of the books that had been analyzed, together with date, edition, and publisher of each. For convenience in checking, the books for each decennium were listed on a separate sheet. The librarian was asked to add to each list, any readers from the fourth up,[2] inclusive, which did not appear on the mimeographed sheets, and to add to the books listed as already analyzed, any editions not indicated in the lists.

The writer was apprehensive lest the rather formidable appearance of the lists might result in their being ignored. Nevertheless, without a single exception the librarians responded; and the letters accompanying the returned check-lists clearly indicated a sincere effort to supply exactly the information sought. In several instances, the librarian called the writer's attention to private collections of old text-books. This library canvass

---

1 This library houses the Barnard text-book collection.

2 In practically all the prefaces the authors indicated the classes for which the readers were designed--whether for "lower," "middle," or "upper." An inspection of second and third readers revealed but little literature, and that of unmistakably juvenile character.

resulted in bringing to light ten readers which had not been found elsewhere. Through the coöperation of the loan department of the Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia, Kansas, these books were procured for analysis. A few readers indicated in the Tingelstad check list, and not found in any of the libraries canvassed, were procured from the Library of Congress.

The writer makes no claim that the books presented in this study are all the books that have been used as reading-books in the advanced classes of our schools. On the contrary, he has found in his study, references to two readers which he has been unable to locate; and he located another, which he was unable to procure for analysis.[1] However, though the list is not an entirely complete one, it represents far more than a judicious sampling, and the writer is confident that the general findings based on this study would not be materially affected were the few books referred to included.

Method of Identifying Literature

In the preceding chapter reference has been made to the fact that neither Reeder, Perkins, nor Tingelstad set up any definite standards for distinguishing between literature and non-literature. The present study demands some more or less objective standard. The very nature of literature makes it imperative that any judgment concerning either its identity or its merits must be more or less subjective. Yet, since there does exist a body of writing to which the name "literature" is given, and another body of writing which is denied that classification, it should be possible to devise some standard for determining what is to be classed as literature and what is to be classed as something else.

---

[1] Osgood's Fifth Reader, a copy of which is reported from the City Library of Meadville, Pennsylvania.

Several methods of setting up such a standard are open to the investigator. He may consult the numerous definitions which have been given for literature, pool these definitions, and formulate a definition of his own. It is obvious, however, that such a method would reduce the process of identification to a single subjective judgment, and render the possibilities of error as numerous as are the selections on which judgment is to be passed.

Another possible method is that of consensus of opinion. In attempting to procure a consensus, the investigator may pursue either of two methods. He may rely upon the judgments of living literary scholars and critics, or he may set up his standard on what has been said by the literary critics--many of them contemporary with the writers whose works they have attempted to evaluate.

It is obvious that the first method would be inadequate. The many hundreds of selections found in the school-readers would have to be submitted to living literary scholars and critics, and their judgments would have to be tabulated. In the first place, such a method involves what is practically a physical impossibility. Moreover, were it possible to select those literary scholars and critics whose judgments are most reliable, and to present the material to them in a form in which it could be judged adequately, it could by no means be assured that the judgments were made on a common basis; there would still be lacking a definite standard. Many of our present-day critics might very naturally judge much of the early material by modern standards, the unfairness of which judgment is clearly manifest.

The second method would be to accept as literature anything from any writer whom the literary critics have included in their lists of writers under the caption of "literature" or of "literary criticism." This method is the one employed in this

study. While it is true that such a method disregards the element of popular approval, the writer is encouraged to leave that factor out of consideration, following the lead of Macaulay, who declared that when the public and the critics differ as to the merits of a writer, the judgment of the critics ultimately prevails.[1] The sources relied upon are Moulton, Chambers, Garnett and Gosse, and the Cambridge Encyclopedia of Literature, English and American.[2] Of these sources Moulton is both the most comprehensive and most specific, and presents a digest of criticism on both English and American writers--some twelve hundred--up to 1904. Chambers, and Garnett and Gosse deal with English writers only; while the Cambridge Encyclopedia has both an English and an American edition.

The writer began by checking on the Moulton list of more than twelve hundred English and American writers, such as were found in the school-readers. All material by these writers was listed as literature. The next step was to check the five hundred and twenty-five writers found in both the Moulton list and the school-readers, against the encyclopedias of literature already cited, and seven anthologies of English literature and seven of American literature that are in use in literature survey courses in the colleges and universities of the country.[3] In this way

---

1 "John Bunyan," Critical, Historical and Miscellaneous Essays, VI, 149. New York: Sheldon & Co., 1871.

2 Charles Wells Moulton, The Library of Literary Criticism of English and American Authors, 8 vols. New York: Henry Malkan, 1910.

3 Edwin Greenlaw and Clarence Stratton, Literature and Life (English and American), Vol. II. New York: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1922.

Edwin Greenlaw and Dudley H. Miles, Literature and Life, Vol. III. Chicago, Atlanta, New York: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1923.

Paul R. Leider, Robert Morss Lovett, and Robert K. Root, British Poetry and Prose. Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1928.

Franklin B. Snyder and Edward D. Snyder, A Book of American Literature. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1927.

(Continued on next page.)

the English writers were sought for in eleven sources and the American writers in nine. The English writers found in all the sources were listed under the caption "universally recognized"; those found in from seven to ten of the sources, inclusive, were listed as "frequently recognized"; those found from four to six times, inclusive, were classed as "occasionally recognized"; while those found three or fewer times were listed as "seldom recognized." The American writers found in all of the sources for American literature were placed under "universally recognized"; those found from six to eight times, inclusive, were listed under "frequently recognized"; those found four or five times, as "occasionally recognized"; and those found fewer than four times were listed as "seldom recognized."

It is logical to assume that those who prepare anthologies

Continued from page 35.

Norman Foerster, American Poetry and Prose. Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925.

Alphonso Gerald Newcomer, Alice E. Andrews, and Howard Judson Hall, Three Centuries of American Poetry and Prose. Chicago, Atlanta, New York: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1929.

John Drinkwater, The Outlines of Literature. New York, London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1923.

Charles Dudley Warner, Library of the World's Best Literature, 30 vols. New York: R. S. Peale & J. A. Hill, 1896, 1897.

Henry Pancoast, An Introduction to English Literature. New York: H. Holt & Co., 1907.

Alphonso Gerald Newcomer and Alice E. Andrews, Twelve Centuries of English Poetry and Prose. Chicago, New York: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1910.

Homer A. Watt and James B. Munn, Ideas and Forms in English and American Literature. Chicago, Atlanta, New York: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1925.

A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller, The Cambridge History of English Literature. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; Cambridge, England: University Press, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, 1915, 1916.

W. P. Trent, John Erskine, Stuart P. Sherman, and Carl Van Doren, The Cambridge History of American Literature, 3 vols. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; Cambridge, England: University Press, 1918, 1921.

John Clark Ridpath, The Ridpath Library of Universal Literature (Compiled from the Guernsey, DePuy, and Ridpath collections, John Clark Ridpath, ed. in chief). New York: The Fifth Avenue Library Society, 1908.

and encyclopedias of criticism, especially those who seek to present surveys of literature, will be compelled, of necessity, to omit from such surveys many of the less important writers; that, on the other hand, certain writers, because of either their superior merit or their historical importance, must be included. No claim is made here that, by such a method as the one outlined, writers can be finally classified as "supremely great," "great," "respectable," "mediocre," and "inferior," or under any other categories which imply relative degrees of excellence. The writer presents whatever general classification may be made from the findings, as the fairest standard to be derived from a consensus. That such a classification has considerable validity is shown by the fact that among the forty-seven English writers universally recognized appear the thirty listed in Craig and Thomas' Great English Prose Writers,[1] and Campbell and Pyre's Great English Poets,[2] and the remaining seventeen are accorded high praise by the critics.

English Writers Universally Recognized

The writers universally recognized are those whom any student of English literature would name were he asked to indicate the leading English writers: Addison, Matthew Arnold, Francis Bacon, William Blake, Elizabeth and Robert Browning, Bunyan, Burke, Burns, Byron, Carlyle, Chaucer, Coleridge, William Collins, Cowper, DeQuincey, Dickens, Dryden, Fielding, Goldsmith, Gray, George Herbert, Robert Herrick, Huxley, Johnson, Ben Jonson, Keats, Charles Lamb, Walter Savage Landor, Macaulay, Thomas Malory, Milton, John Henry Newman, Pepys, Pope, Sir Walter Raleigh, Ruskin, Scott, Shakespeare, Shelley, Spenser, Steele, Swift, Tennyson, Thackeray,

---

[1] Hardin Craig and J. H. Thomas, Great English Prose Writers. New York: F. S. Crafts & Co., 1929.

[2] Oscar James Campbell and J. F. A. Pyre, Great English Poets. New York: F. S. Crafts & Co., 1928.

Thomson, and Wordsworth. Collins, Herbert, and Herrick might not be included in a list made off hand; yet the critics have been loud in their praise of these three poets.

English Writers Frequently Recognized

Fifteen names were selected at random[1] from those writers frequently recognized.[2] A study of the criticisms on these fifteen writers shows Young condemned by the leading critics, and commended by the minor ones; Horace Walpole universally praised for his unique style;[3] Crabbe, Hood, and Lytton generally praised; Darwin praised for his straightforward style; Dekker severely criticized by some but praised by the leading critics; Thomas Fuller commended by such critics as Coleridge, Gosse, and Saintsbury; Kingsley praised and condemned in about equal measure; Smollett, Jeremy Taylor, Ascham, and Berkeley highly praised as stylists; and Richard Baxter and Sir Thomas Browne generally praised in high terms. This brief digest of criticism reveals the fact that practically all those writers frequently recognized in the sources used by the writer range from general recognition to high rank among the critics. Darwin, who belongs to a later period of our literary history, has had his style graciously considered by the critics.

English Writers Occasionally Recognized

As in the case of those writers frequently recognized, the writer selected at random fifteen of those writers who were

---

[1] The names were grouped as U's, F's, O's, and S's; and each group was arranged alphabetically. Each deck was then shuffled, and every fifth card was dealt from the U's and S's, every tenth card from the F's, and every twentieth card from the O's. When a deck was run through before the required fifteen names had been procured, that particular deck was reshuffled, and cards were dealt from it as before, until the required number had been procured.

[2] See references to criticisms in Supplement I.

[3] Material from his pen found in the readers was from his correspondence.

occasionally recognized in the sources. Examination of the criticisms shows that Matthew Green was capable of occasional achievements of merit; that Frances Havergal and John Hawkesworth possessed power, but lacked some essential quality; that the critics were divided on William Allingham, John Byrom, and Francis Mahoney, but conceded to each certain outstanding merits; that Elizabeth Carter and Caroline Norton were not great, but each, because of a peculiar character of theme or treatment, is entitled to recognition; that Thomas Frognall Dibdin was praised as a bibliographer; that Thomas Guthrie was accorded high rank as an orator, George Sandys as a translator, and Edward Stillingfleet as a preacher; and that Robert Fabyan, James Hervey, and Ambrose Phillips were generally condemned.

English Writers Seldom Recognized

Of the fifteen writers selected at random from among those seldom recognized, Thomas Bayley, William Dodd, Richard Edwards, John Wallis, John Langhorne, Lord Mahon, and William Whitehead are all but universally condemned for their poor style. Of the others Robert Hall is praised for his vigorous style, which style, however, is marred by archaic qualities which render it unfit for modern readers; Manning is not considered a literary genius; William Thompson is given mild praise, but little adverse criticism; and Sir Benjamin Thompson, Helen Williams, James Harris, George Granville, and Thomas Warton are praised by some, condemned by others.

American Writers Universally Recognized

The American writers universally recognized, as was the case with the universally recognized English writers, were those one would name if asked to indicate America's leading writers: Poe, Bryant, Emerson, Lanier, Longfellow, Lowell, Whittier, Drake,

Holmes, Cooper, Hawthorne, Irving, Thoreau, Whitman, Frenau, Halleck, Timrod, Parkman, and Franklin. Among the American poets universally recognized, are the nine found in Page's Chief American Poets. Each of the remaining four is accorded high praise by the critics.

American Writers Frequently Recognized

From among the American writers frequently recognized the writer selected fifteen at random: George Henry Boker, William Bradford, John C. Calhoun, Alice Cary, R. H. Dana, Jr., R. H. Dana, Sr., Timothy Dwight, Jonathan Edwards, Alexander Hamilton, Francis Hopkinson, Joaquin Miller, Thomas Paine, William Gilmore Simms, John Trumbull, and George Washington.

Of these Boker and the younger Dana are generally praised for their style: the one for his sonnets and dramas; the other for his outstanding contribution--Two Years before the Mast. Bradford is praised for simplicity, sincerity, and accuracy; Dwight for scholarship and occasional excellence; Calhoun, Edwards, Hamilton, and Washington for logical thinking and clear, terse English; Hopkinson and Trumbull, for satire and humor; R. H. Dana the elder, for poetic originality and intellectual vigor; Alice Cary for poetic insight rather than for skill as a writer of beautiful verse; Simms as an admirable writer of light literature and as a storyteller; Miller as an excellent poet whose lines are frequently marred by crudities; and Paine as a prose writer of power who was frequently shallow, violent, and scurrilous.[1]

American Writers Occasionally Recognized

Fifteen names were taken at random from among those of writers occasionally recognized. A study of the criticisms shows that Henry Ward Beecher was regarded as a preacher rather than as

---

[1] The Catholic critics are the most unkind to Paine.

a writer; and that Orville Dewey, also a preacher, was praised for intellectual strength rather than for elegance of style; that James Gates Percival and Abram Joseph Ryan were poets of the lower order who were capable of occasional flights of power and beauty; that the critics are divided as to the merits of Mary Abigail Dodge, Orestes Brownson, Lucretia Davidson, Frances Osgood, Rufus Choate, and George Pope Morris; that Charles Sumner was a statesman whose speeches are worth preserving; that Louis Agassiz was praised for his style; that Henry Clay's speeches, though charming in their delivery, disappoint in the reading; that J. T. Fields was praised as an editor and publisher; and that Helen Hunt Jackson was a writer who possessed power but lacked some essential quality of literary greatness.

American Writers Seldom Recognized

Of the fifteen selected American writers seldom recognized, William Livingstone and John Jay are regarded primarily as statesmen; some of Schoolcraft's work is valuable for its information, but his style is crude; Thomas Starr King is praised especially for his saintly character, and John G. Palfrey, a historian, is praised for accuracy and for ease of style; the critics agree that Hannah Adams' productions were useful, and that Horace Bushnell had a creative mind of a high order, and a decided elegance of style; James Kent was a jurist of high rank, and a clear, forceful writer; the critics do not agree on the merits of J. A. Hillhouse, John Pierpont, Marie Sedgwick, and Joseph Story; Benjamin Silliman is praised chiefly for his travel sketches and lectures; and John Brainard and Robert Ingersoll are classed as decidedly inferior.

A study of the available criticism on these writers thus chosen at random seems to warrant the assumption that practically all of the writers--both English and American--that are universally

recognized are at least "superior" writers; that those frequently recognized may be safely classed as "highly respectable"; that those seldom recognized may be classed as "occasionally possessing merit"; that those seldom recognized are, taken as a whole, "inferior."

With such a standard of classification before him the writer found it possible to classify the literature of each decennial period by noting what writers contributed the greatest amount of material, and placing that writer's material under his classification. If the major percentage of the material for a particular decennium was found to be by writers who were universally mentioned in the sources, the major portion of the literature of that period could be called eminently respectable. Moreover, the remainder of the literary material could be classified under such categories as "by writers frequently noted," "by writers occasionally noted," and so on.

Analyzing the Material

The writer felt that a study of this kind should not stop at merely identifying and classifying the literary material found, but that it should present a more or less detailed analysis of it. He has, therefore, attempted to present it under the following divisions: (1) verse and prose, (2) whole and part-whole, (3) informational and non-informational, and (4) didactic and non-didactic. Such a method of analysis makes it necessary to set up certain criteria, or at least to make clear the principles which governed the analysis.

Literary Material

Under this classification has been placed all material from the Bible. Warner has said that the Bible is the best illustration of the literature of power, for it always concerns itself

with life, and touches it at all points, thereby qualifying as literature because of its universal appeal to human nature.[1] In 1902, another scholar lamented the fact that our schools had impoverished both life and literature by neglect of the English Bible, and referred to the Bible as "the source from which much of what is best in later centuries is drawn, the inspiration upon which the best English style has been built."[2]

Eggleston asserts that the King James version of the Bible was almost the only refining and enlarging literary influence during the early period of settlement in America.[3] Horace Scudder once said, in speaking before the N. E. A., that within the lids of the Bible were shut all those literary forces which made for the spiritual enrichment of the boy and girl.[4]

That the Bible is literature would hardly be questioned; and inasmuch as all the Bible selections found in the school-readers were taken from the Psalms, Proverbs, the synoptic gospels, and the Pauline letters, the writer has not hesitated to classify the Bible material found as literature of power.

Historical material.--When the work of a historical writer appears in the sources relied on in this study, it has been classified as literature. Such a classification has been considered valid for three reasons: first, because the historical material reported in this study as literature was the work of writers listed in the encyclopedias of literary criticism; second, because these same writers have been represented in the anthologies of literature;

---

[1] Charles Dudley Warner, The Relation of Literature to Life, p. 35. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1897.

[2] Nicholas Murray Butler, "Some Pressing Problems," National Education Association Proceedings (1902), 73.

[3] Edward Eggleston, The Transit of Civilization, p. 98. New York: Appleton & Co., 1901.

[4] "The Place of Literature in the Common-school Education," N. E. A. Proceedings (1888), 62.

third, because the scholars and critics have recognized the literary character of historical material. Material from the pens of Bancroft, Robertson, Macaulay, and Gibbon, appears in many anthologies of literary material. Bancroft and Robertson are frequently noticed, and Macaulay and Gibbons are universally noticed.

One of America's greatest scholars has said:

> Sentences of clarified wisdom may be literature no less than stanzas of inspired song, or the intense utterances of impassioned feeling. The personality of the sunlight is in the keen lines of light that run along the edges of a sword no less than in the burning splendor of the rose or the radiant kindlings of a woman's eye. You may feel the power of one master of thought playing upon your brain as you may feel that of another playing upon your heart.[1]

The same authority says further that there are books reckoned primarily books of science and of scholarship which nevertheless have standing as literature, and cites the writings of Newton and Gibbon as examples. He says that Gibbon's fame, if it continue, will be kept alive by love of his art, rather than by worship of his scholarship.[2]

Another student of literature cites Macaulay, Green, and Froude as writers who treated historical material in a literary manner.

> This (Canada and the Provinces) is history as literature, facts treated by the literary and not by the 'bookkeeping method'; the past made alive and significant, and the affairs of to-day given an equal place with those of the past.[3]

Finally, no less an authority than Schlegel praises the literary excellence of the great historical compositions that England produced during the Eighteenth Century, especially those of Hume, Robertson, and Gibbon.[4]

---

[1] Woodrow Wilson, Mere Literature, p. 20. Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1896.

[2] Ibid., p. 22.

[3] Constance Lindsey Skinner, "History as Literature: and the Individual Definition," Bookman, XLIX (Aug., 1919), 752.

[4] Frederick Schlegel, Histoire de la Littérature Ancienne et Moderné, pp. 222, 223, Tome second (translation by William Duckett). Paris: Th. Ballimore, Libraire, 1829.

Scientific Material.--The writer is conscious of the fact that it is more difficult to make a case for science than for history, inasmuch as there is in historical literature an inherent element of imagination whose function it is to reconstruct the past and make it seem real; an element of prophecy which looks into the future, and constructs social and political institutions that are yet to be. But science, by its very nature, holds the imagination in leash and denies its devotees the right to prophesy and, at the same time, remain scientific. Again, however, the writer has felt himself justified in classifying scientific material as literature, on the same three grounds as those on which he classified historical material as literature. The encyclopedias of literary criticism devote considerable space to what the literary critics have had to say of the works of those whom we regard primarily as scientists. The anthologies, especially those of more recent date, have not been niggardly in according space to the writings of Humboldt, Newton, Huxley, and Darwin.

Nor is there lacking reputable authority for regarding science as literature. Even DeQuincey, by implication at least, grants it a right to be regarded as literature of knowledge.

> The very highest work that has ever existed in the literature of knowledge is but a provisional work: a book upon trial and sufferance, and quamdiu bene si gesserit. Let its teachings be but placed in a better order, and instantly it is superseded. For instance, the Principia of Sir Isaac Newton was a book militant on earth from the first. And as soon as La Place, or anybody else, builds higher upon the foundations laid by this book, effectually he throws it out of the sunshine into decay and darkness.[1]

It is obvious from the use of Newton's Principia as an example, that DeQuincey was willing to concede literary merit to a purely scientific production, limiting it, however, to literature of knowledge.

---

1 "Pope," Essays on the Poets, p. 155. Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1856.

From the reference already cited, it is clear that Wilson would not exclude scientific material from consideration as literature, simply because of the subject matter.[1]

Morley, while he intimates that the literary art that deals with scientific subject matter is not of the highest order, declares that there is no more lucid, manful English than can be found in the writings of Huxley; that there is nowhere a more delightful book of travel than Hooker's Himalaya Journal; that French critics count Buffon among their greatest writers for order, unity, precision, method, clearness in statement, and majestic gifts of natural eloquence; that Gray was a naturalist as well as a poet; and that Göethe--the greatest of them all--was a writer in whom were united high original scientific power of mind and transcendent gifts in flight, force, and beauty of poetic imagination.[2]

Burroughs, who of all those who assumed to speak with authority in the fields of both science and literature was most inclined to set science apart, has said that Tyndall, in his Fragments, often rises into the realm of literature; that Henri Bergeson, on almost every page, states a scientific fact in the picturesque and poetic manner of literature. Burroughs sums up his discussion of particular writers by saying that the writings of Tyndall and Huxley were almost all good literature because these writers were masters in the art of expression, and gave us a lively sense of the working of their own minds.[3]

Julian Hawthorne has said that much true literature is not imaginative, and that Aristotle and Huxley, though not on

---

1 Wilson, op. cit.

2 Lord Morley. "The Literary Shortcomings of Scientific Men," Scientific American Supplement, Supplement No. 1841, LXXI (April 15, 1911), 227.

3 John Burroughs, "Science and Literature Contrasted," N. A. Review, CXCIX (March, 1914), 419, 420.

Homer's and Shakespeare's level, wrote real literature.[1]

At the meeting of the National Educational Association, in 1894, a spirited discussion arose over the report of the English Committee of Ten. The report said, in part: "Reading-books should be of a literary character, and should not attempt to teach natural history or physical science." Professor Parker asked what would become of literature if nature were taken out of it. Superintendent Maxwell, of Brooklyn, fell back upon DeQuincey's division of literature into literature of power and literature of knowledge. The problem presented by the report was the old problem as to whether or not science is to be considered literature. The attitude reflected in Professor Parker's question is the attitude of the writer in this study. He makes an appeal for a more liberal interpretation of the term literature. Yet, though he would extend the definition to mean more than belles-lettres, he recognizes the necessity for limiting the material, other than belles-lettres, to which he would give the name literature. The standard of identification has already been described.

In attempting to justify the classification of certain scientific material as literature, the writer has had some apprehension lest, in avoiding one difficulty he encounter a greater. While the citing of specific authorities may seem an attempt to identify literature by means of definitions, such has not been the writer's purpose. He has sought, rather, while adhering to the standard of identification heretofore set up, to show that even those who would make a rather sharp distinction between literature and science, concede that scientific material may be, and indeed often is, good literature.

---

[1] Julian Hawthorne, "Is Journalism the Destroyer of Literature?" Current Literature, XL (Feb., 1906), 272.

Verse and Prose

Distinguishing between verse and prose presented little difficulty, inasmuch as the mechanical form of the material, in practically all cases made identification merely a clerical process. In some cases the writer found rhyming lines written in prose form,[1] and several Biblical narratives in blank verse. In such cases the selections were listed in the analysis as verse.

Wholes and Part-Wholes

In listing material as whole or part-whole, the writer has used his own arbitrary standard. In all cases when the material adequately presented the thought suggested by the title, it was listed as whole. Under such a rule the same selection might be listed at one time as whole and at another time as part-whole. Indeed Hamlet's soliloquy on death appeared several times under the title "Hamlet's Soliloquy on Death." In such cases the selection, when complete, was classified as whole. In another book the same thing appears under the title "Hamlet," where it was listed as part-whole.

All literary units which had been in any way abbreviated were classified as part-wholes. In one reader Shelley's "To a Skylark" appeared with four of the verses missing, and was reported as part-whole. Where that part of Webster's reply to Hayne in which he paid his tribute to Massachusetts was presented as "A Tribute to Massachusetts," it was counted as whole; where, under the caption "Webster's Reply to Hayne," the entire speech was not given, the selection was marked part-whole. All selections presented as "extracts" were classified as part-wholes. The sense in which the writer has used the terms "whole" and "part-whole"

---

[1] Longfellow, "Song of Hiawatha," Sargent's Standard Fourth Reader, Part II. W. I. Pooley & Co., 1862.

is, however, not the sense in which these terms were used by President Eliot and others who, about the last decade of the nineteenth century, savagely attacked what they termed the "hodge-podge" of the school-readers. The prevalence of so-called "fragments" in several school-readers might very well have been due to qualities inherent in the type of material used, rather than to carelessness or caprice on the part of the compilers. Very few fragments are found among the poetic selections; while in those reading-books which stress elocution and declamation, insistence upon complete orations and political speeches would have narrowed the field to a few English and American orators.

Informational, Non-Informational, and Composite

What the writer had in mind in making the informational, non-informational, and composite classification was something very much like DeQuincey's famous "literature of power" and "literature of knowledge," with their inevitable concomitant, knowledge-power. The purpose in making a classification in lieu of that of DeQuincey was to avoid both the technicalities involved in that classification and the confusion into which those have fallen who have attempted to interpret DeQuincey's definition. In this analysis, those selections which, from their nature, seem to have been designed to impart information have been classified as informational; those in which the purpose is evidently to inspire, rather than to instruct, have been listed as non-informational; while those which both instruct and inspire have been classified as composite. A few illustrations may serve to make the method clear.

> But no description can give an idea of the strangeness and beauty of the sight. Its great size--for it must have been two or three miles in circumference and several hundred feet in height; its slow motion, as its base rose and sank in the water, and its high points nodded against the clouds; the dashing of the waves upon it, which, breaking high with foam, lined its base with a white crust; and the thundering sound of the crackling mass, and the breaking and tumbling down of huge pieces, as well as its

nearness and approach, which added a slight element of fear--all combined to give it the character of true sublimity.[1]

It spread over the bays that receive the Saco and the Penobscot. Its loud reveille broke the rest of the trappers of New Hampshire, and ringing like bugle notes from peak to peak, overleapt the Green Mountains, swept onward to Montreal, and descended the ocean river till the responses were echoed from the cliffs of Quebec.[2]

No hand is needed to trim its fires, to temper its glow, to remove its ashes. Smoke there is none; flame there is none.[3]

The little Slicking river, as it comes bounding down the almost precipitous sides of an adjacent mountain, appears beautiful, very beautiful; the distance is such that it looks scarcely larger than the ribbons of our modern belles, while it appears buoyant with life itself, as it dances and springs onward in its merry course, until lost among the surrounding cliffs.[4]

Down sinks the long water-line into the black deep; down go the porcelain crags and galleries of glassy sculpture, a speechless and awful baptism. Now it pauses and returns; up rise sculptures and crags streaming with the shining white brine; up comes the great encircling line, followed by things new and strange--crags, niches, balconies, and caves; up, up it rises, higher and higher still, crossing the very breast of the grand ice, and all bathed with rivulets of gleaming foam.[5]

He opened his lips. His heart, big with the destinies of the world, struggled for a moment with doubt--but no longer. The electric appeal shot forth, darted on, flashing fiercer and brighter, and growing in overwhelming majesty, until the last words, "Give me liberty, or give me death!" filled up its measure of terrible might; and the last link of the chain that had eternally bound the form of freedom was riven. He had finished his sublime task; the Revolution was afoot.[6]

These are offered as composite selections. That they are informational can hardly be denied; but that they are more than information seems clear also. The facts of geography and history

---

1 Richard Henry Dana, "An Iceberg," Arnold and Gilbert's Stepping Stones to Literature, VI, p. 150. New York: Silver Burdett & Co., 1897.

2 George Bancroft, "The News from Lexington," Butler's Fifth Reader, p. 156. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co., 1883.

3 George Wilson, "Human Caloric," Butler's Fifth Reader, p. 71. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co., 1883.

4 Anon., "Mountain Scenery in South Carolina," Babcock's Southern Reader and Speaker. Charleston, S. C.: Babcock, M'Carter & Co., 1860.

5 Louis L. Noble, "The Turning of an Iceberg," Boltwood's Grammar and High School Reader, p. 67. Chicago: George Sherwood & Co., 1886.

6 By "A New Yorker," "A Sketch," Southern Reader and Speaker, p. 130. Charleston, S. C.: Babcock, M'Carter & Co., 1860.

are clothed in the light garments of fancy. Their composite character is made more evident by contrasting them with the following selections.

> A glacier is a river of solid water confined in the depressions running down the mountain sides. Soft and powdery snow falls upon the summit; and though some of it is evaporated, the yearly fall is greater than the yearly loss, so the excess is pushed down the slopes which in Greenland on the East or Alaska on the west, lead to the ocean.[1]

> In the beds of the reptile age are fossils of many other strange animals; and among them are two great fish lizards, as large as whales. Both of these lived in the water and perhaps came on land sometimes; and it is certain that they must have been very ferocious creatures, from their great size and sharp teeth.[2]

Here are facts stated as facts, with scarcely a figure of speech, with no effort at adornment. Such selections the writer has listed as informational.

Under non-informational material have been placed such selections as would seem to belong to that type of literature which DeQuincey called the "literature of power." All selections which move the reader rather than instruct him, may be classified as literature of power, or non-informational literature.

Didactic and Non-Didactic Material

The term "didactic," like the term "literature," presents some difficulties. If the term were used in its widest significance, hopeless confusion would result. Facts about geography, botany, zoölogy, history, astronomy, and mathematics, and every poem, as well as every prose selection, which contains a statement of fact, would have to be classified as didactic. There has been nothing like a substantial agreement in the use of the term, but the writer has adopted the meaning implied in statements such as

---

[1] Anon., "Icebergs," Todd and Powell's Normal Course in Reading, p. 25. Boston: Silver, Burdett & Co., 1891.

[2] Arthur Nicol, "Marvels of Ancient Life," Swinton's Fifth Reader, p. 187. New York, Chicago: Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor & Co., 1883.

the following ones.

There lingers in all our hearts a desire to utter moral platitudes, to dwell lingeringly and lovingly upon the obvious; but alas! we are not Mrs. Barbaulds, and this is not the year 1780.[1]

The stress of life here is upon the moral and intellectual elements much more than upon the esthetic. We demand a message of the poet, or that he shall teach us how to live.[2]

Some of the great literature of the world has been professedly and intentionally didactic. There have been many poems, especially among those of perhaps second rank, which have sought to teach the principles of right conduct, individual and social.[3]

Beauty, whether we like it or not, has a heart full of service. In an unfinished world, where religion has become so largely a matter of traditional sentiments and observances, poetry has a work to do, poetry of any high seriousness.[4]

There does not seem to be an agreement as to what didactic literature should teach. Some would restrict it to the teaching of morals; others would add to morals, ethics; while yet others would include patriotism and the purely social graces. It seems, too, that some would require that the writer's purpose must be to teach, before a production may properly be called didactic. The point at which the authorities might be inferred to agree is that the term "didactic" should not be applied to material that is purely informational.

The writer has felt himself on safe grounds in classifying as didactic all selections which clearly teach the social graces or moral, ethical, and patriotic lessons. In making his classification, he has, in the absence of the author's express statement of purpose, assumed that the selection in which the lesson was

---

1 Agnes Repplier, "A Happy Half-Century," Harpers, CXIV (Feb., 1907), 440-43. (In this article Hannah More, Mrs. Barbauld, Mrs. Hemans, Lady Montague, and Jane Porter are described as characteristically didactic.)

2 John Burroughs, "Literature and Science," Century, XLI (April, 1902), 853-59.

3 Elizabeth Nitchie, The Criticism of Literature, p. 94. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1928.

4 Stuart P. Sherman, The Genius of America, p. 26. New York, London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.

patent from a mere reading, was to be regarded as didactic, without reference to the author's purpose. He has, moreover, avoided classing as didactic any selection in which the lesson was not clearly obvious. In each case wherein the theme was at all obscure, the selection has been classified as non-didactic. In practically every case the lesson which the selection presents has been identified by both the writer and his helper. In Worcester, he had the assistance of Miss Gertrude Ware, a graduate student in Clark University; in Cambridge, his assistant was Mrs. K. B. Edgerton, a graduate of Radcliffe College, with a Master's degree conferred by Harvard. A few examples will serve to illustrate the method used in determining the didactic material.

A favorite in the school-readers is Herrick's "To Daffodils."

Fair Daffodils, we weep to see
  You haste away so soon:
As yet the early-rising Sun
  Has not attain'd his noon.
    Stay, stay,
  Until the hasting day
    Has run
  But to the even-song;
And, having pray'd together, we
  Will go with you along.

We have short time to stay, as you,
  We have as short a Spring;
As quick a growth to meet decay
  As you, or any thing.
    We die,
  As your hours do, and dry
    Away
  Like to the Summer's rain;
Or as the pearls of morning's dew,
  Ne'er to be found again.

Such a selection, while about daffodils, reveals in its lines the fact that daffodils serve only as a text from which Herrick preaches us a sermon on the frailty of human life.

Our own poet, Bryant, describes a lone bird beating the air with tired pinions. He devotes seven stanzas to his picture,

in which we even get some idea of the habits of the bird; then he concludes with the stanza.

He who from zone to zone
Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
In the long way that I must tread alone,
Will lead my steps aright.

Could Bryant have made it clearer that his purpose was to preach Divine guidance?

Why does Whittier describe the dark day of 1780, and tell with so much minute detail the story of Abraham Davenport, unless he wishes to impress the lesson of the concluding stanza?

And there he stands in memory to this day,
Erect, self-poised, a rugged force, half seen
Against the background of unnatural dark,
A witness to the ages as they pass,
That simple duty hath no place for fear.

On the other hand let the stanzas from one of Burns's poems be considered.

Till a' the seas gang dry, my dear,
And the rocks melt i' the sun,
I will luve thee still, my dear,
While the sands of life shall run.

The writer did not classify these lines as didactic. The entire poem is of too personal a character to justify its being so classified. The writer felt that, in such cases, the universal note was lacking.

A comparison of this stanza with Bourdillon's little four-line poem will tend to make clear the writer's position.

The mind has a thousand eyes,
And the heart but one;
Yet the light of a whole life dies
When love is done.

A poem like Lucy Larcom's "In Time's Swing" is a didactic poem, as its title implies; but the theme is hidden from the ordinary child who reads that poem. Such selections the writer has not hesitated to classify as non-didactic. But, while the ordinary school child would be unable to get Miss Larcom's theme from a

reading of her poetry, what child would miss the point in this one?

> Yet the hope, how sweet, again to meet,
> As we look to a distant strand;
> Where heart meets heart, and no more they part
> Who meet in that better land.

Wirt's "The Blind Preacher," which occurs very frequently in the school-readers, could not, under the rules laid down by the writer, be classed as didactic. It is a sketch that charms the reader with its grace and touches him with its pathos; but the preacher's climax (taken from Rousseau): "Socrates died like a philosopher; Jesus Christ died like a god," does not give the selection didactic quality. The statement quoted is only a detail of the story--only the climax of a well-written narrative. To attempt to make anything else out of it would be to do violence to the entire selection.

In like manner, it would be inaccurate to classify Poe's "Raven" as didactic, even though the frequent refrain seems to be an expression of regret for wrong-doing or wasted opportunity. There is nothing in the poem, when it is taken in its entirety, which would justify its inclusion as didactic poetry.

Other Purposes of the Study

There are certain problems which have naturally grown out of this analysis of reader-content. In analyzing the material, the writer has felt himself confronted by the following questions:

1. To what extent have children's interests entered into the selection of reader-content?

2. What importance have the compilers of our advanced school-readers attached to literature?

3. Has the literature of the readers seemed to reflect great factors that have influenced our national growth; for example, agrarianism, education, economics, religion, temperance, slavery, war and peace, and national consciousness? To what extent

has the non-literature material reflected these factors?

4. Is there, for each decennial period, a single reader, or a few readers, that adequately reflect the reader content for that period?

An attempt will be made to answer these questions in Chapter IV, and by means of the data tabulated in Supplement II, Tables X to XXI, inclusive.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

With the materials of this study before him, the writer feels justified in summarizing certain findings, and venturing certain conclusions. Whatever value the findings may have rests upon the assumption that in education, as in any other social institution, a thorough understanding of past developments leads to a more intelligent appreciation of the present.

Literature As Reading-book Content

One thing that this study clearly reveals is that from the beginning the compilers of school-readers have recognized literature as an essential feature of textbook content. In Chapter I, the writer has set forth in considerable detail a résumé of the prefaces of school-readers from 1792 to 1898. This résumé shows that the compilers have regarded literature as a powerful agent for the teaching of political, social, moral, and religious lessons. An inspection of these prefatory statements also reveals, from the first, a recognition of the esthetic qualities of literature, although throughout most of the entire period the chief emphasis has been on its character-building functions.

A study of the prefatory statements in Chapter IV discloses also a desire on the part of the compilers to present not only "literature," but literature of a high degree of excellence. This desire is evidenced by the constant recurrence of such expressions as "masterpieces of style," "the best in English and American literature," "literary masterpieces," and "the best literature in the

language." That the literary selections found in the readers were not, as Reeder intimates and Mahoney asserts, "erratic efforts and random shots in many directions," is apparent from an analysis of the literary content of the readers. To the writer it seems more logical to attribute whatever inferiority in literary quality may be found in particular periods, to the temporary emergence of certain objectives, rather than to random shots in many directions.

Since much great prose and poetry is not didactic, and much mediocre prose and poetry is, it would seem almost inevitable that a period which emphasizes the didactic will not present as much superior literature as will a period which is primarily interested in literary quality. Hence, the dominance, in any period, of mediocre and inferior literature need not be regarded as the result of random guesses, but rather as the result of emphasis placed on objectives other than literary excellence. A brief reference to certain periods will serve to illustrate.

Quality of the Literature

The table at the end of Chapter III shows a decrease of about 12 per cent in superior literature for the decennium 1791-1800 over that of the preceding period. This may be partially explained by the fact that of the few reading-books in circulation from 1781 to 1790, all but one had been compiled in England, and were predominantly literary in character. Moreover, the five new books of American authorship which appeared between 1791 and 1800 ranged in literary content from none at all to over 40 per cent. In no one of these five books does the compiler recognize the necessity for emphasizing literary material, the emphasis being placed almost entirely on didactic value and appropriateness for oral reading and declamation.

The table in Chapter III also shows a marked decrease in

superior literature from 1821 to 1830. This decrease can probably be explained without attributing it to "random shots." Of the nineteen new readers for the period, nine emphasize such things as morality, patriotism, and interestingness, and express a decided preference for the productions of American writers. Inasmuch as there was at this time comparatively little superior material of American authorship, it is obvious that such an objective as the one last mentioned would, if adhered to, result in a decided reduction in the volume of superior literary material.

The period 1831-1840 shows a still further decrease in superior literature. In all but three of the thirty reading-books of this period, the chief emphasis is on such things as variety, brevity, morality, patriotism, interestingness, and comprehensibleness, and on scientific, rather than on literary material. There is also an increased demand for the productions of "modern writers"; Pierpont's gentle insistence upon a wider recognition of American writers has become a ringing protest against the un-American practice of filling our reading-books with material by British authors. The influence of such objectives and patriotic preachments might very well account for the predominance, in this period, of mediocre and inferior literature. When literature is made the hand maiden of interestingness, morality, science, and national pride, the quality of the literature must of necessity suffer unless superior literature can supply the material sought and serve the ends desired.

From 1861 to 1900 there is a consistent increase in the percentage of superior and excellent literature. This increase may very reasonably be attributed to the fact that from 1860 on, the compilers, as evidenced by their prefaces, almost unanimously agreed that literature, rather than history or science, should

constitute the bulk of reading-book content. With literature recognized as the content core, compilers would naturally scrutinize more carefully the quality of the literary selections which they admitted to their compilations.

Another Factor Influencing Literary Quality

Reference to Chapter IV will emphasize another objective which must have influenced the quality of literary content no little. In that chapter the writer has attempted to show that from the very beginning the compilers have acknowledged the obligation of presenting material which might appeal to the needs and interests of children. It is not unlikely that a compiler who sought to present material suitable for children might reject Milton and substitute Mrs. Hemans, or even Mrs. Barbauld. However inexcusable such a substitution might be on the grounds of relative literary excellence, it might be entirely justifiable on grounds of utility.

However, notwithstanding the occasional emergence of these objectives, and the consequent occasional increase in mediocre and inferior literature, the entire period covered by this study shows a persistent tendency toward literary content and, after 1860, a gradual refinement of literary quality. The study shows, moreover, that in general, the content of the reading-books for each decennial period reflects the objectives set forth in the prefatory statements of purpose. Such a conformity between objectives and content, whatever else it may or may not indicate, does not support the statement that the selections of the compilers were "erratic efforts and random shots in many directions."

It will be seen that at no time since the first reading-book of American authorship, 1785, have compilers been indifferent to the interests of children. It is obvious, nevertheless, that with few exceptions these compilers have been the sole judges of

what constituted fit material for their youthful readers. That some of the compilers recognized certain educational principles which are to-day generally conceded, is evident from a digest of the prefaces; but there are few evidences that the material selected for inclusion in the reading-books was tested in the light of these principles.

It is also clear that the compilers who were disinclined to select the material arbitrarily, relied upon a consensus of teacher opinion, the scope and reliability of which are matters of conjecture. The only exceptions were Hyde's School Speaker and Reader of 1900, the contents of which were selected to meet the requirements of the compiler's young son, and Lippincott's Fifth, 1881, a large part of whose contents was selected by school children.

It will appear then that the compilers of reading-books have, from the first, sought to ascertain the needs of the child; and while, to the present-day student of education, the methods used to ascertain these needs seem inadequate, the facts remain that these compilers used such methods as they had at hand; that scientific methods in education had not yet been evolved. The use of such methods as they had at their disposal, although based on personal opinion and on the preference of a few, are not, in the writer's judgment, to be dismissed as erratic.

Factors in National Development

Economics.--The great economic movement known as the Industrial Revolution made itself felt in the United States principally after the Civil War. Table I, Supplement I, reveals the fact that while this period shows a decided increase over the preceding half-century, it does not present so high a percentage of economic items as do the forty years from 1781 to 1820. While the figures seem

to support a conclusion wholly at variance with what might be expected, the difference may be explained on at least two grounds. During the first forty-year period there was a relatively high frequency for certain items which appear but seldom in the period 1861-1900. While a greater number of the nineteen items appear in the latter period, the percentage is generally not so great as in the initial period. On the other hand, certain items like "the value of labor," "the dignity of labor," and "the inadequacy of wealth"--all three of which items associate themselves with such economic movements as the organization of labor unions and the growth of a capitalistic order--appear more frequently from 1861 to 1900, and are relatively infrequent of mention from 1781 to 1820. In brief, those items which make up the major part of the frequencies for the latter period are items which are rather closely related to the Industrial Revolution, and such general items as "economy," "economy of time," "thriftiness," "evils of luxury," and "evils of gambling"--none of which has any specific relation to the Industrial Revolution--account for the higher frequencies of the preceding decenniums.

Another explanation for the anomaly may be found in the fact that during the period 1781-1820 there was no subject allied to economics that was taught anywhere except in one or two colleges; whereas, after the development of this subject in the colleges, it was taught as a separate subject in the high schools, and the necessity for such reader-content was, in large measure, obviated. If the economic items on "value of labor," "dignity of labor," and "inadequacies of wealth" are taken from the frequency of all economic items for each period, it will be seen that the 4377 didactic items for the period 1861-1900 supply four economic items fewer than do the 1562 didactic items for the period 1781-

1820.

Another interesting fact revealed by this table is the varying degree of emphasis placed on certain items in separate decades. For example, "thriftiness" is stressed more from 1801 to 1810 than at any other period, ignored entirely from 1811 to 1820, mentioned but once in the next period, accorded, in the period of the financial panic, an importance almost as great as from 1801 to 1810, and mentioned rather consistently to 1890. As might be expected, "economy" is emphasized in the decade of the panic of 1837 and the decade immediately following; but, contrary to expectation, it is not emphasized during the two panic periods of 1873 and 1893. The emphasis on "frugality" and "thriftiness" parallels that placed on "economy"--which is again what might be expected. Nevertheless, "the evils of wealth" is emphasized in the first panic period, but practically ignored in the other two. Gambling, which was rampant in the first half-century of our national life, does not demand particular attention until the decade immediately preceding the panic of 1837, and the succeeding decade, after which time it decreases in importance to 1850, and disappears entirely after 1860.

There appears to be no justification for concluding that the frequency of the economic items--with the possible exception of "value of labor," "dignity of labor," and "inadequacy of wealth"--can be explained on the grounds of their timeliness or appropriateness. A more nearly justifiable conclusion is that the more general, rather than the more specific economic themes are emphasized throughout the entire period; and that only a few, like those which bear a close relation to the Industrial Revolution, reflect the spirit of the times. To assert, however, that this relationship between frequency of mention and economic conditions

was the result of design, even with reference to these three items, is to assert what can not be proved.

Education.--Table II, Supplement I, at first glance, appears a bit more promising than Table I. The student of educational history, if asked to designate the period at which education began to assume real importance in the United States, would probably select the closing years of the decade 1821-1830. The items "importance of education" and "importance of knowledge" may be taken as most nearly epitomizing the spirit of an educational awakening. These items, if frequency of mention be taken as the standard of comparison, show a decided spurt in the period 1831-1860. If, however, the comparison be made on the basis of percentage of all didactic themes, the difference is not so marked, although the percentage of mentions in the latter is more than twice that of the period up to 1830.

If the total frequency of the twenty-one items up to 1830 be taken as a percentage of all didactic items for the period, and compared with the percentage which the same items constitute for the period 1831-1900, the difference is not so significant as when the two items are compared--the ratio of the first period to the second being 2.9 to 4.3. Inasmuch as the two items "importance of education" and "importance of knowledge" are consistently persistent, they furnish the better basis for comparison.

The table presents some rather disturbing data from 1841 to 1900. The decades between 1841 and 1860 present the highest percentages for the entire period covered by the study. This high peak is followed by a general decline for the remainder of the period to 1900. The rather marked decline in the decade 1861-1870 may be due, in considerable measure, to the disturbances incident to the Rebellion and Reconstruction; but the fact that no period

subsequent to 1870 presents as high a percentage of educational material as do the decades 1841-1850 and 1851-1860 can not be attributed to the war and its aftermath. To the writer, the most reasonable explanation lies in the fact that from 1875 on, education ceased to be the controversial issue that it had been; its merits were pretty generally recognized.

National Consciousness.--Table III, Supplement I, presents the data for the twenty-five items placed under the category "National Consciousness." Of these items political equality, political freedom, the necessity for, and the indissoluble character of the Union, and the greatness of the United States are by far the most persistent and frequent. These four items are emphasized from 1831 to 1870, or roughly speaking during that period of our national history which marks the rise of States rights, the War of the Rebellion, and the reconstruction period. The two items "necessity for Union" and "greatness of the United States" are emphasized from 1851 to 1870--the period during which national legislation concerned itself with compromise measures designed to prevent secession; the period during which the South seceded and states rights were put to the arbitrament of the sword; and the period during which the shattered Union was working out the problems of reconstruction.

An interesting feature of this table, when all the items are considered together, is the consistently high relation between the twenty-five items and the total of all didactic items, during three of the war-decades of our national history: 1841-1850, 1861-1870, and 1891-1900. In the main, this table reflects, rather faithfully, the spirit of the time.

Religion.--Of the sixty-six items of Table IV, Supplement I, those which maintain a rather consistent frequency throughout the

entire period covered by this study have to do, in some way, with the attributes of God and man's relations to Him. The few items concerning God which show low frequencies are those which bear a close resemblance to other items whose frequencies are high. For example, the item, "God-source of strength," occurs but twice; but the item "power of God" appears 110 times.

Tingelstad found that by 1830 the religious element in the school-reader content had become negligible. Table IV shows that no single decennium, except 1801-1810 and 1851-1860 shows as high a percentage of religious material as does the decennium 1821-1830. This must not, however, be interpreted as a contradiction of Tingelstad's findings. The methods used in the two studies were different, Tingelstad having used the page-count method; whereas the writer has used frequency of theme as his basis of estimate. Moreover, the present study presents a survey of advanced readers only; while Tingelstad's included the reading-books for all the grades, and in addition certain spellers and catechisms. With the mass of material with which he deals, it is conceivable that the amount of religious material revealed by the present study, which is considerable, would be, when estimated as a percentage of the material included in his study, practically negligible by 1830, the year to which the Tingelstad study was extended.

It is certain that what is true of all the school-readers, including those for the higher grades, is not true of the readers for the upper grades alone. The writer knows of no explanation which can be supported by authority. It may be significant, however, that by 1830--the date at which Tingelstad reports the religious content of the school-readers as negligible--the Sunday School was a fairly well established institution, one which without doubt cared for the religious instruction of those to whom it

ministered. It was probably true then, as it is true now, that comparatively few of the children of advanced standing in the day school, were attendants at Sunday School. Such a situation would necessitate the inclusion of religious material in the advanced school texts, and justify the exclusion of such material from the reading-books for the beginning grades. Although the prefaces of the decennium 1821-1830 deplore Sabbath desecration, growing disrespect for God, and the evil effects of infidelity; and although one compiler of the 1851-1860 period asserts the necessity for a school-reader which will "assist the home, the church, and the Sunday School," the prefatory references are too few in number to warrant the conclusion that the conditions complained of influenced the choice of reader-content to any appreciable degree.

Agrarianism.--Agrarianism is the only one of the seven factors of national growth selected by the writer which does not show a respectable frequency. Notwithstanding the facts that Jefferson and his followers recognized the importance of agrarianism, and that the struggle between capitalism and agrarianism later resulted disastrously to the South, the reference to it in the readers is hardly worth noting, being at no time higher than eight-tenths of one per cent, as shown in Table V of Supplement I. This extremely low frequency may result from one of several causes or from all combined. The writer may have confined the term "agrarianism" within too narrow limits; many of the implications of the term may be included under "economics"; or the controversial character of the subject may have resulted in the exclusion of much material that bore directly on the issue. Whatever the explanation, the fact remains that the school-readers do not, in any decade, reflect the importance of agrarianism as a national issue.

War and Peace.--This item presents the only marked example

in this study of what is known as curriculum lag. Some of the other items seem to indicate a lag within certain decennial periods; but "war and peace" shows rather clearly a lag of as much as a decennium. The table shows that there is a rise in percentage in the decades following the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the War of the Rebellion, the only exception being the decade following the Spanish-American War.

Perhaps such a "lag" is to be expected. Wars are not generally foreseen. They are sudden like outbursts of angry passion, and they produce such devastating effects that a nation has difficulty in imagining a recurrence. For the first few years after a war, the unreasonableness and awfulness of such conflicts are emphasized, but such things are forgot in the absorbing problems of peace.

The only explanation the writer is able to suggest for the exception found in the period following the Spanish-American War is that the results of that war did not noticeably affect our national existence; the fatalities were comparatively few; and the conflict possessed the romantic glamour of a crusade.

Slavery.--Table VIII reveals an interesting fact. The item "blessings of physical liberty" shows a relatively high frequency from 1831 to 1900; whereas "evils of slavery" receives less attention during the period of anti-slavery agitation than during the two decades preceding. It will be observed also that the general item "blessings of physical liberty" persists; whereas the specific item "evils of slavery" practically disappears after the war. While it seems strange that the one issue which was striking to the very heart of the nation received scant attention, it must be remembered that although school-readers were designed to assist in inculcating moral sentiments, they were also designed to sell. To avoid all

controversial issues was a wise business policy.

Temperance.--In order to reflect faithfully the temperance sentiment, the period between 1826 and 1874 should show increasing percentages. Before 1826 there were only a few small and comparatively inchoate groups of temperance workers in this country. In 1826, the American Temperance Society was organized; and in 1829 the New York State Temperance Society came into existence--an organization which, by 1830, had 100,000 active members. In 1833 certain influential members of Congress formed what was known as the Congressional Temperance Society. In 1842 the Sons of Temperance was organized. In 1865 a consolidation of the existing temperance organizations took the name "National Temperance Society." In 1869, at Chicago, the temperance movement assumed political form under the name "National Prohibition Party"; and in 1874 the Woman's Christian Temperance Union was formed.

So far as organization was concerned, the years from 1826 to 1874 were active years. Reference to Table VI shows that this period is characterized by higher frequencies than the periods preceding and following. Notwithstanding these higher frequencies, however, the number of mentions, when taken as percentages of the total number of didactic items, shows a considerable decrease over the period from 1781 to 1820. If this decrease resulted from anything other than mere chance, it may probably be explained by the fact that these temperance societies had each its publications through which it sought to reach the people; and the compilers of the reading-books left the discussion of this controversial question to such organizations.

Morals and the Social Graces.--A glance at Table IX reveals the primary and major interest of the compilers. From 1781 to 1900 morals and social graces constituted from one-fourth to one-half

of all didactic items. This frequency conforms to the objectives of the compilers, as those objectives are stated in the prefaces. If frequency of mention may be taken as an indication of importance, the ten most important items, in their order of frequency, are physical courage, virtuousness, contentment, justice, righteous living, hopefulness, charitableness, honesty, kindness, and humility. The frequency of these ten items constitute slightly more than 35 per cent of the frequency for forty-three items under the category of Table IX.

It appears, then, that of the eight factors of national growth arbitrarily selected by the writer, only two: "national consciousness" and "religion," are repeatedly mentioned in the prefaces; only these two and the added item "morals and social graces" present frequencies which justify the conclusion that they were emphasized to reflect certain definite forces in our national life.

The prefatory statements of objectives, when studied in connection with the content of the readers, justify the conclusion that the presentation of literature was apparently a major purpose of the compilers, from 1781 to 1900, and that the purpose was, at all periods, to present literature of excellent quality. Notice should be taken of the fact that literature must be considered apart from these eight arbitrarily-selected forces, inasmuch as these forces are emphasized by means of both literary and non-literary material. Tables I to IX indicate the percentage of both literary and non-literary material for each item. The only deduction which seems justifiable is that those items which are generally regarded as possessing a strong emotional element present a relatively high percentage of literary material; whereas those items which primarily challenge the thinking are more apt to yield

a high percentage of non-literary material. Such items as "truthfulness" and "tolerance," which may be discussed either logically or emotionally, show variations at different periods.

It would seem a fair summary of the evidence on these eight hypothetical factors of growth to assert that only "national consciousness" and "religion" seem to have been consciously emphasized in the content material; but the selections which have to do with the remaining six no more frequently reflect the objectives found in the prefaces, than they might have done had the selection of content material been purely haphazard.

One can not come to the end of such a study as this without a clearer understanding and a deeper appreciation of the objectives and ideals of those educational pioneers into whose hands were committed the destinies of four generations of future American citizens. Nor can one wholly escape the conviction that these same pioneers laid consciously--and often better than they knew--the foundations on which succeeding generations have reared our present magnificent educational structure.

SUPPLEMENT 1

A TABULATION OF NINE FACTORS IN OUR NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

SUPPLEMENT I

Table I

Economics

Items Mentioned	1781 to 1790		1791 to 1800		1801 to 1810		1811 to 1820		182 to 183	
	L[1]	NL[1]	L	NL	L	NL	L	NL	L	
Commerce (value of)										
Debt (evils of)										
Economy--of time	1	1		2	2	1	1		1	
Economy				2	2	1	1			
Frugality	2	1	3	3	2	3	1			
Labor (value of)	1	1	1	1			1			
Labor (dignity of)			1			1				
Luxury (evils of)				1		1			1	
Labor, child (curse of)										
Money (proper use of) ..										
Thriftiness			1		3	3			1	
Wealth (evils of)				1	2					
Wealth (inadequacy of) .						1			3	
Gambling (evils of)		1		2	1	1		1	2	
Poverty (curse of)							1		1	
Industry (protection of)									1	
Inventions (benefits of)										
Steam (power and uses) .										
Total	4	4	6	12	12	12	5	1	10	1
Per cent of all didactic items	2.1	2.1	1.1	2.2	2.2	2.2	1.8	.4	.7	1
All didactic items, by periods	192		535		555		280		1,52	

[1] L indicates literature; NL, not literature.

1831 to 1840		1841 to 1850		1851 to 1860		1861 to 1870		1871 to 1880		1881 to 1890		1891 to 1900		1901 to 1906	
L	NL	L	NL	L	NL	L	NL	L	NL	L	NL	L	NL	L	NL
	2					1 1		1							
2	14	2	6	1	2	2	2	1		1		1		1	
4	4	1		1	3	1		2		1		1			
2	3	2	2	3	4	9	3	7	6	11	1	4	3	2	
		3	3	5	7	1	3	5	2	2		3	3		
				1											
								1		1					
								2					3	3	
3	4	2	1	3	1	3	1		2	3					
2	3	1		1	1	1			1						
3	1			3		1	4	3	3	3		2	1	1	
	4		2		7		1								
	1		1			1	2						1		
														1	
									1						
13	36	11	15	18	25	21	16	22	15	22	1	11	11	8	
.6	1.6	.8	1.0	.6	.9	1.4	1.1	1.9	1.3	2.4	.1	1.3	1.3		
2,200		1,432		2,809		1,454		1,165		935		823			

SUPPLEMENT II

A TABULATION SHOWING REPRESENTATIVE READERS

FOR

EACH DECENNIAL PERIOD

Table XIV

1821-1830

Reader	Poetry	Prose	Did.
Anon., The American Reader	16.3	83.7	56.9
Anon., The Juvenile Instructor	8.2	91.8	83.7
Anon., The New York Reader, No. 3	14.0	86.0	61.4
Bartlett, The Practical Reader	24.1	75.9	73.5
Bentley, The American Instructor	18.7	81.3	87.9
Coale, The American Lady's Preceptor ..	9.4	90.6	88.4
Collier, The Evangelical Instructor ...	8.4	91.6	51.1
Cook, The Student's Companion	72.5	27.5	50.0
Dickinson, The Columbian Reader	23.4	76.6	41.8
Greenwood and Emerson, Classical Reader	26.6	73.4	60.8
Lowe, The Columbian Class Book	11.3	88.7	5.7
Morrill, The Scholar's Companion	22.4	77.6	67.6
Murray, The English Reader (Goodrich) .	30.4	69.6	64.7
Murray, The English Reader	31.9	68.1	87.9
Murray, Sequel to the English Reader ..	37.3	62.7	83.8
Olney, The National Preceptor	39.3	60.7	52.6
Pierpont, American First Class Book ...	45.6	54.4	36.6
Pierpont, The National Reader	35.0	65.0	58.2
Putnam, The Analytical Reader	23.0	77.0	50.0
Putnam, Sequel to the Analytical Reader	16.4	83.6	72.0
Strong, The Common Reader	17.7	82.3	76.5
Willard, The General Class Book	11.8	88.2	22.5
Worcester, The Friend of Youth	26.2	73.8	67.3
Median	23.3	76.7	62.0

In this period either Putnam or Dickinson is typical of poetry and prose content; the revised New York Reader, No. 3, of the didactic and non-didactic; Dickinson for whole and part;[1] Pierpont's National Reader, for knowledge; Morrill or Pierpont for power; Strong, for knowledge-power; and

[1] Is exactly the median.

on-d.	Whole	Part	Knowl.	Power	K-P	Lit.	Non-lit.
43.1	75.0	25.0	44.8	53.6	1.6	42.1	57.9
16.3	96.5	3.5	7.3	62.9	29.8	17.2	82.8
38.6	84.2	15.8	27.1	70.9	2.0	53.1	46.9
26.5	66.3	33.7	3.6	96.4	0	47.1	52.9
12.1	93.1	6.9	3.3	48.0	48.7	15.5	84.5
11.6	85.5	14.5	12.0	88.0	0	18.3	81.7
48.9	96.8	3.2	54.1	36.9	9.0	6.2	93.8
50.0	89.3	10.7	25.9	73.3	.8	73.4	26.6
58.2	85.7	14.3	18.7	75.1	6.2	48.4	51.6
39.2	86.3	13.7	25.1	59.7	15.2	74.7	25.3
94.3	83.0	17.0	70.9	11.0	18.1	51.0	49.0
2.4	67.6	32.4	13.2	66.5	20.3	39.5	60.5
35.3	51.9	48.1	23.9	73.3	2.8	79.5	20.5
2.1	77.9	22.1	2.5	69.5	28.0	80.1	19.9
16.2	97.1	2.9	3.9	58.6	37.5	98.9	1.1
47.4	81.8	18.2	7.4	87.2	5.4	66.4	33.6
63.4	73.9	26.1	8.7	70.9	20.4	70.2	29.8
41.8	90.3	9.7	15.4	65.7	18.9	51.8	48.2
50.0	91.2	8.8	27.6	64.4	8.0	37.9	62.1
28.0	72.0	28.0	13.5	48.5	38.0	52.6	47.4
23.5	95.1	4.9	10.6	79.0	10.4	24.1	75.9
77.5	95.8	4.2	65.0	27.0	8.0	9.1	90.9
32.7	71.4	28.6	28.1	46.9	25.0	36.1	63.9
38.0	85.7	14.3	16.7	66.0	10.0	47.5	52.5

Bartlett for literature. The number of books could be reduced by the following combination: Dickinson for poetry, prose, whole and part; New York Reader, No. 3, for didactic and non-didactic; Pierpont's National Reader, for knowledge and power; Strong, for knowledge-power; and Bartlett's Practical Reader, for literature and non-literature.

SUPPLEMENT III

The following digest is a summary of the opinion of critics concerning the writers selected at random, as indicated in Chapter II. The purpose of this index is to designate the class into which each of the writers falls. The letter "F", as used in the index, indicates that the writers so labeled are frequently recognized in the sources enumerated in Chapter II; that those labeled "O" are occasionally recognized; and that those labeled "S" are seldom recognized.

Adams, Hannah	S	Dwight, Timothy	F	Miller, Joaquin	F
Agassiz, Louis	O	Edwards, Jonathan	F	Morris, George P.	O
Allingham, William	O	Edwards, Richard	S	Norton, Caroline	O
Ascham, Roger	F	Fabyan, Robert	O	Osgood, Frances	O
Baxter, Richard	F	Fields, J. T.	O	Paine, Thomas	F
Bayley, Thomas H.	S	Fuller, Thomas	F	Palfrey, John	S
Beecher, Henry W.	O	Granville, George	S	Percival, James	O
Berkeley, George	F	Green, Matthew	O	Phillips, Ambrose	O
Boker, George H.	F	Guthrie, Thomas	O	Pierpont, John	S
Bradford, William	F	Hall, Robert	S	Ryan, Abram J.	O
Brainard, J. G.	S	Hamilton, Alexander	F	Sandys, George	O
Browne, Sir Thomas	F	Harris, James	S	Schoolcraft, H. R.	S
Brownson, Orestes	O	Havergal, Frances	O	Sedgwick, Marie	S
Bushnell, Horace	S	Hawkesworth, John	O	Silliman, Benjamin	S
Byrom, John	O	Hervey, James	O	Simms, William G.	F
Calhoun, John C.	F	Hillhouse, J. A.	S	Smollett, Tobias	F
Carter, Elizabeth	O	Hood, Thomas	F	Stillingfleet, E.	O
Cary, Alice	F	Hopkinson, Francis	F	Story, Joseph	S
Choate, Rufus	O	Ingersoll, Robert	S	Sumner, Charles	O
Clay, Henry	O	Jackson, Helen H.	O	Taylor, Jeremy	F
Crabbe, George	F	Jay, John	S	Thompson, Benjamin	S
Dana, R. H. Jr.	F	Kent, James	S	Thompson, William	S
Dana, R. H. Sr.	F	King, Thomas S.	S	Trumbull, John	F
Darwin, Charles	F	Kingsley, Charles	F	Wallis, John	S
Davidson, Lucretia	O	Langhorne, John	S	Walpole, Horace	F
Dekker, Thomas	F	Livingstone, W.	S	Warton, Thomas	S
Dewey, Orville	O	Lytton, Bulwer	F	Washington, George	F
Dibdin, Thomas F.	O	Mahon, Lord	S	Whitehead, William	S
Dodd, William	S	Mahoney, Francis	O	Williams, Helen M.	S
Dodge, Mary A.	O	Manning, Henry E.	S	Young, Edward	F

DIGEST OF CRITICISM

Adams, Hannah (1755-1832)

Miss Adams was the first woman in the United States to make literature a profession. The critics content themselves by merely suggesting the "usefulness" of her productions,[1] which were chiefly of a historical nature, but were not characterized by any striking elegance of style.[2] A View of Religious Opinions, which was her principal work, passed through several editions in the United States, and was republished in England. It is a work of great research and erudition.[3]

Agassiz, Louis (1807-1873)

Theodore Lyman says that Agassiz became a master of English composition, and spoke the language not only with fluency, but with a voluble eloquence which was peculiarly his own.[4] In speaking of his essay on "Classification," Edwin P. Whipple says that the reader continually feels the power and comprehensiveness of his mind, both in the graceful ease with which an immense knowledge is borne, and the vigorous felicity with which that knowledge is expressed.[5] He was noted, not only for his gift as a teacher and his powers of observation, but for a happy method of stating scientific truths--a method which makes his writings interesting to the general reader as well as to the specialist.[6] There was never any question, among

---

[1] Review of S. Willard's "Adams' Religions," North American Review, VII (May, 1818), 86.
Charles F. Richardson, American Literature, 1607-1885, I, 452. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1887.

[2] Evert and George Duyckinck, Cyclopedia of American Literature, ed. M. Laird Simons, I, 425. Philadelphia: Baxter Publishing Co., 1881.

[3] Charles Wells Moulton in A Woman of the Century, cited in Moulton, op. cit., V, 124.

[4] "Recollections of Agassiz," Atlantic Monthly, XXXIII (1874), 223.

[5] Whipple, Character and Characteristic Men, p. 278. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1883.

[6] Warner's Library of the World's Best Literature, Bibliophile Ed., I, 213. New York: J. A. Hill & Co., 1902.

scientific scholars, as to his right to speak with authority in his field.[1]

Allingham, William (1824-1889)

E. C. Stedman finds in Allingham's verse "a grace which no amount of artifice can ever hope to produce, and for whose absence mere talent can never compensate."[2] Robert Chambers says: "His verse is free from obscurity, mysticism, or the 'spasmodic' temper; is fresh and graceful, shows a delicate fancy and, especially in the lyrics, a sweet and varied melody."[3] Allingham does not rank among the foremost of his generation, though when at his best, he is an excellent poet, simple, clear and graceful.[4] Hugh Walker describes him as "an Irish poet of much taste, but of no great power."[5]

Ascham, Roger (1515-1568)

Edmund Gosse thought his literary style in direct contradiction to the spirit of the age in which he wrote.[6] Another writer criticizes Ascham's highly mechanical structure.[7] "His rules did not make Ascham a master of style, but they at least show him to have had a true perception of its qualities."[8] Henry Hallam puts him above all other writers of the first half of Elizabeth's reign.[9]

---

1 Moulton, op. cit., VI, 722-26.

2 Victorian Poets, pp. 258, 259. Boston, New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1893.

3 Cyclopedia of English Literature, ed. Patrick, III, 605. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1904.

4 Richard Garnett in Dictionary of National Biography, ed. Sidney Lee, Supplement, XXII, 39. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1909.

5 The Age of Tennyson, p. 256. London: G. Bell & Sons, 1908.

6 Short History of Modern English Literature, pp. 79, 80. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1902.

7 Edwin Herbert Lewis, History of the English Paragraph, p. 80. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1894.

8 Henry Craik, ed., English Prose, I, 268. New York, London: Macmillan & Co., 1893.

9 Introduction to the Literature of Europe, I, 380. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1854.